

In the Matter of Amendment of Part 15
Regarding New Requirements and
Measurement Guidelines for Access
Broadband Over Powerline Systems

To: The Commission

ET Docket No. 04-37

CURRENT Technologies, LLC, (CURRENT) in its Opposition to Petitions for Reconsideration contains extensive single-spaced text and a so-called “Technical Appendix.” The Technical Appendix was nothing more than an in-depth, *Trojan horse* criticism of the Petition for Reconsideration of the Association for Maximum Service Television, (MSTV), Inc. The material was clearly not reference material for the body of CURRENT’s Opposition document as one would expect an appendix to be, but instead more

ranting and superfluous criticism of a Petitioner that was not included within the body of the document.¹ CURRENT apparently saw fit to use such an approach to attempt to skirt the strict requirement of a 25 page maximum length for Oppositions.

Regulations 47 CFR Sec. 1.49(a) and 1.429(f) require that Oppositions not exceed 25 double-spaced pages, exclusive of Table of Contents, Face Sheet and certification statements; and that they not contain extensive single-spaced footnotes and other addendums to avoid maximum length requirements. This was pointed out in my Reply to its Opposition.²

CURRENT plainly sought to blatantly exploit and circumvent these limits to its own end and advantage through the use of extensive single spaced “bulleting”, obese footnoting and by calling what clearly belonged in the body of the submittal a “Technical Appendix.”

Further, CURRENT has the audacity to claim now, in their eleventh-hour Reply to their Oppositions (of which I was not one), that my statements in

¹ CURRENT Opposition “Technical Appendix”

² McVey Reply to Opposition at 2.

³CURRENT Reply at 1.

my Reply to its Opposition pointing out their infractions were not correct.³

Apparently, CURRENT doesn't understand content requirements for

Replies to Oppositions either.

Therefore, once again, I request that the Commission comply with its rules of Practice and Procedure and quash, dismiss, or otherwise set aside, with Prejudice, and without leave to resubmit, the CURRENT Opposition dated March 23, 2005.

Respectfully Submitted April 6, 2005,

/s/

W. Lee McVey, P.E.
1301 86th Court, NW
Bradenton, FL 34209-9309
(941)761-2475

**CERTIFICATION OF SERVICE UPON CURRENT TECHNOLOGIES,
LLC**

I certify that I, W. Lee McVey, P.E., placed a true copy of the foregoing Supplement to Reply to the Opposition to the Petition for Reconsideration prepared by W. Lee McVey, P.E. in the United States Mail, on April 6, 2005; to be delivered via first class mail to CURRENT Technologies, LLC, at the address of its counsel noted below:

Mr. Mitchell Lazarus
Counsel for CURRENT Technologies, LLC
Fletcher, Heald and Hildreth, PLC
1300 North 17th Street, 11th Floor
Arlington, VA 22209

/s/

W. Lee McVey, P.E.